

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,173	06/13/2001	Tomoyuki Asano	09792909-5110	7206
26263	7590 10/20/2005		EXAMINER	
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			POINVIL, FRANTZY	
P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			3628	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Application/Control Number: 09/880,173

Art Unit: 3628

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. There appears to be an error in the identification of the response filed 7/11/2003. The first page of the response to the office action of 4/8/2003 is correct in properly identifying the instant application. However, a reference is made on top of pages 2-7 identifying the instant response for patent application Serial Number 9/188,831 and a response to an Office action dated August 14, 2002. Since the instant response was timely filed in relation to the prior Office action and arguing the applied reference, the Examiner will treat the instant response as a proper response and accept the noted misidentification of pages 2-7 as a typographical error.
- 2. Applicant's arguments are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al. (US Patent No. 6,560,581).

As per claims 17, 21 and 25, Fox et al disclose a system and method for accounting for a fee concerning service provided to a user by a service provider such as merchant. The system and method comprise step or means for:

Receiving from the service provider a charge collection request based on a service request sent from the user to the service provider (column

Informing the charge collection to the user based on the charge collection request received from the service provider and

Verifying validity of the charge based on the service request and digital signature based on the service request.

Applicant is referred to column 24, line 31 to column 26, line 2 of Fox et al.

Fox et al does not explicitly teach "when an objection to the fee is received from the user", performing the verifying function. As per this limitation, the Examiner asserts that in most transactions, the consumer is usually presented with a statement acknowledging a purchase order or verifying that the costs or charges made by a merchant are correct before proceeding with making an actual payment. An objection to the costs, charges or fees would have then been made by the purchaser or buyer. Performing the same function in the system of Fox et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to prevent disputes between al involved parties in the transaction.

As per claims 18 and 20, 22 and 24, 26 and 28, Fox et al disclose the service request and the digital signature are provided from the user and/or from the service provider. Note also column 24, line 31 to column 26, line 2 of Fox et al.

Art Unit: 3628

As per claims 19, 23 and 27, the service request and the digital signature for verifying are provided via a storage medium connectable to a user terminal. See column 24, line 31 to column 26, line 2 and figure 18 of Fox et al.

## Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantzy Poinvil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FP September 29, 2005

FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Au 3 628